REMARKS

Claims 1-18 and 43-56 were presented for examination. The Examiner allowed claims 1-18 and 44-56; and rejected claim 43. Applicants are hereby amending claim 43. Reconsideration of this application as amended, and allowance of all claims remaining herein, claims 1-18 and 43-56 as amended, are hereby respectfully requested.

It is noted that the Office Action Summary, paragraph 6, erroneously states that claims 1-18 and 43-56 were rejected. In reality, the Examiner allowed claims 1-18 and 44-56. See the Detailed Action section of the Office Action, paragraph 1.

In his third paragraph, the Examiner indicated that a complete set of black and white drawings are required. Applicants are submitting to the Official Draftsman, under separate cover, a complete set of black and white drawings.

In his fourth and fifth paragraphs, the Examiner rejected claim 43 under 35 U.S.C. §101 as non-statutory, on grounds that the preamble to claim 43 does not recite a technological basis.

In response to this rejection, Applicants are hereby amending claim 43 to recite in the preamble that Applicants' method is "computer-implemented".

There is now a technological basis in the preamble of claim 43. Therefore, the Examiner is requested to withdraw his rejection of claim 43 and to allow this claim as amended.

Applicants believe that this application is now in condition for allowance of all claims remaining herein, claims 1-18 and 43-56 as amended; and therefore an early

Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. If the Examiner disagrees or believes that, for any other reason, direct contact with Applicants' attorney would help advance the prosecution of this case to finality, he is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,

Edward J. Radlo Attorney of Record Reg. No. 26,793

SONNENSCHEIN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP P. O. Box 061080 Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080 (415) 882-2402

cc: A. Glodjo (via e-mail)
IP/T docketing CH